

REMARKS

With respect to the Office Action dated August 3, 2004, Applicant notes with appreciation that claim 5 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

However, claims 1, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 20 were rejected under U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,727,940 ("Oka et al."). Furthermore, claims 2-4, 11, 14 and 19 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Oka et al. and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,317,127 ("Daily et al."). In response, Applicant has canceled claims 8, 9 and 20 to simply reduce the total number of claims. Applicant has also amended independent claim 15 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. In addition, claim 14 was amended so that claim 14 now correctly depends on claim 13. Furthermore, Applicant has added new claims 21-23, which include subject matter similar to or related to the subject matter of the "objected to" claim 5. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of the pending claims 1-7, 10-19 and 21-23.

A. Patentability of Independent Claims 1, 10, 13 and 15

The Office Action has rejected the independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 15 under U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Oka et al. The independent claim 1 recites a method of providing images to a remote site comprising:

"sensing an image of a scene;
establishing a connection with a remote site;
transmitting the sensed image to the remote site;
receiving a selection of a subimage of the sensed image from the
remote site;
generating the subimage from the sensed image; and
transmitting the subimage to the remote site" (emphasis added).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPFP §2131.

The cited reference of Oka et al. does not disclose the element of "transmitting the sensed image to the remote site," as recited in claim 1. Oka et al. discloses an image distributing system that includes a camera server 1301 and computer terminals ("clients") 1302, 1303, 1304... connected to the camera server, as shown in Fig. 13 (see column 4, lines 29-35). Each client can designate a required area 1402 in an image-sensible range 1401, which the client user wants to sense, as illustrated in Fig. 14 (see column 4, lines 42-63). The camera server 1301 calculates an area ("an image sensing area") 1504 that includes all the required areas 1501, 1502 and 1503 required by the respective users, as illustrated in Fig. 15 (see column 4, lines 1-13). The image sensing area is sensed by the camera server, as described in column 13, lines 16-19. However, the sensed image of the image sensing area is not transmitted to the clients. Only the respective required areas are extracted from the sensed video image and distributed to the respective users, as described in column 13, lines 19-21. Thus, the claimed element of "transmitting the sensed image to the remote site" is not disclosed. Consequently, the independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Oka et al. and should be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the independent claims 10 and 15, which include similar limitations. The independent claim 10 recites in part, "transmitting the sensed image to the remote sites," while the independent claim 15 recites in part, "an image processing system operably coupled to the image sensor, wherein the image processing system receives image data from the image sensor, **transmits the sensed image to remote sites**, generates subimages of the sensed image, and transmits subimages to the remote sites upon request by the remote sites" (emphasis added). The above remarks are also applicable to the independent claim 13, which recites an element of "receiving a sensed image of a scene to be observed." Since Oka et al. does not disclose "transmitting the sensed image to the remote site," Oka et al. also does not disclose "receiving a sensed image of a scene to be observed," as recited in claim 13. Therefore, the independent claims 10, 13 and 15 are not anticipated by Oka et al. and should be allowed.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claim 2-7, 11, 12, 14, 16-19 and 21-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-7, 11, 12, 14, 16-19 and 21-23 depends on one of the independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 15. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Bronson

Date: November 1, 2004

By: Thomas H. Ham
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300